The INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY.

WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE

No. 519. Published weekly at 115 Goulburn St., Sydney. SATURDAY JUNE 26th, 1920. Registered at the General Post Office Sydney, for transmission by post as a Newspaper. PRICE 1D.

THE TROUBLES OF REACTION.

Whom does the A.L.P. represent? Obviously, not the capitalist. Ostensibly, the working class. We have repeatedly shown that the true interests of the working class are not fought for by the A.L.P. The industrial unrest that must grow with each day will inevitably force the Labor Party, both in N.S.W. and in Queensland, further to demonstrate the futility of their existence as a working class party. When the fork in the road is reached, the Labor Parties will either have to stand pro-capitalist or receive the abuse and more—from capitalism. But until such a time they are able to sail merrily along under a bleached red flag and to hold the ignorant support of a large mass of workers. For each section of the community, they have something as bait. Yet the poor, faithful and misled worker fails to see the gross contradictions in the A.L.P. policy, which result from catering to the needs and interests of "all sections of the community." By this policy it brands itself as spineless and opportunist and in general as middle class.

The present N.S.W. State Labor Conference provides ample proof that the A.L.P. is nothing more than an organisation living on ignorance. That it is a middle class party, in the interests it represents and in the ideas it expresses. The conference decision on the land question is a concrete example of the middle class position of the party in carrying a resolution.

"That conference urge upon the Government the immediate necessity of resuming the leases now held by the large land companies in the eastern portion of the Western Land Division, and make the same available to bona fide land seekers in 8000 acre blocks under the leasehold tenure."

This will be explained by the A.L.P. as an attack upon capital and therefore in the interests of the worker. But the question to be answered is, how can workers work eight thousand acre blocks of land? Where can he obtain the necessary machinery and stock, etc., necessary for such a large tract of land? If it is proposed to aid the "bona-fide" land-seekers, would it not be better for the A.L.P. to go ahead with its State "Socialism" programme, and to own and run the land with day labor? The Labor Party is certainly well advised to let the individual take the risk rather than provide the workers with further demonstration that its policy of "socialism" under the capitalist state is an impossibility and a delusion.

Assuming that there is no mistake in the figure, 8000 acres, it is obvious that the cutting up of the very large estates merely leads to the further development of the middle class, whence the A.L.P. would gain further support, as having "done something" for the farmer. The "something" in question would be the opportunity to starve in silence one hundred miles from anywhere. If, by any chance, the land had to be divided up into still smaller blocks, the situation of the men who could prove themselves to be genuine land-seekers would be even worse.

The solution of the land question is not to be found in the cutting up of large estates and the creation of a class of small landowners, but in the ownership of the land by the people—all of them. And then only those who are actually using it in a useful way shall have any rights as to occupation. The actual solution, we thus see, can only be accomplished after the working class as a whole has raised itself to the position of master class as the first step in establishing socialism.

* * *

WHAT EVERY GOVERNMENT NEEDS.

Yet another aspect of Labor Party politics presents itself in the visit to London of Mr. Theodore, Premier of Queensland, for the purpose of obtaining money—£20,000,000—to enable his government to carry its legislation into effect. It is interesting to note that Sir Robert Philp, as a representative of the vested interests of the State, is playing a prominent part in the negotiations with British finance.

It is readily understood that a government without money cannot "carry on," and that those who provide the money will only do so so long as, and to the extent that they have control over the government. Thus there were many queries raised by British Imperial financiers as to the legislation of the Ryan-Theodore Ministry and as to its intentions. It may not be generally known, but the Queensland Labor Government advertises itself abroad, in England and North America, as a "socialist" government, and Mr. Ryan has circulated a booklet entitled "Socialism at Work," which is a description of the enterprises owned and run by the State. Further, the Queensland Labor Government has made definite appeals to the British workers in describing its State as a "workers' paradise." It is not surprising then, that British finance is suspicious of the Queensland Labor Government, and it seems that with the aid of Sir Rob. Philp, Mr. Theodore had to get his red flag dyed the conventional yellow, condemn his countrymen for taking politics "too seriously," and, like the N.S.W. Labor Government, promise to keep well within the bounds of moderation and to introduce nothing of a "confiscatory nature."

To the extent that the A.L.P. represents the smaller interests—the middle class, socially—does it find itself in opposition to the greatest capitalists. The clash of interests in London was not between Capital and Labor, as the A.L.P. would have us believe, but between the upper and middle sections of the community. Were it between Capital and Labor, that is, between property-owners and propertyless, there can be little doubt that what every government needs—money—would not be forthcoming.

In the case of a locally raised loan it is possible for an appeal to be made to the middle class and to the workers themselves, as was done in the English Victory Loans and the American Liberty Loan, and for the Labor Government further to delude the people that it is not the capitalist class that supports the government.

Economically, it is understood that all the wealth of present-day society is produced by the application of labor-power to natural resources, and that of the total wealth of the working class receives an amount that corresponds generally to the value of its particular commodity, labor-power. The balance belongs to the capitalist class, for the efficient maintenance of whose interests it is necessary to have specialists in the art of governing other men and women. They must have armies, navies, police, prisons, churches, etc., and it is out of their share—the lion's share—of the total wealth produced that all these institutions, so obviously necessary to class government, are paid for. The main purpose of the treasurer's annual budget is to get this money from the individual capitalists, who often squeal and try to "pass it on" to some other individual capitalist, but in general, all governments are maintained by the master-class in their own interests out of their share of the total wealth produced.

Looking at government from this angle, the "Communist Manifesto" pointedly describes parliament as the executive of the master-class. This is exactly the position of any government under the present system, for while the capitalists are in a position to refuse to finance a Labor Government voluntarily, they are compelled to do so through the usual channels of taxation by force of economic necessity.

Thus a party, whatever its name, sells its "soul" to the master-class on assuming the reins of government. A party that is working-class in fact as well as in name, can only assume political power as the dominant class. The A.L.P. in failing to make this its objective brands itself as reactionary, and must ultimately give way to that body of men and women who, backed by an oppressed working-class, seek to raise the banner of the Proletarian Dictatorship and Socialism.

Why America went Dry.

Much to the annoyance of middle-class respectability the socialist insists that the whole activity of the capitalist system is centred upon making profits, on accumulated surplus wealth from the propertyless workers in processes of production. When, for example, it is stated that the United States went dry because prohibition meant increased profits for American capitalism, the idea is poo-poo-ed, but once in awhile the daily papers, also middle-class, tell us things that were better hidden. An excellent example of this is to be found in the Sydney "Daily Telegraph" of June 10. The following quotation is delightfully candid:—

"While prohibition was for years preached with customary fervor by its advocates on moral grounds, it had only the slenderest chance of winning over the nation until the business community came to the aid of the temperance advocate upon coldly-balanced considerations of financial profit and loss. When the business man had satisfied himself that alcohol diminished efficiency he became its foe. The position taken up was that every employee represented a fund of human energy, to the last fraction of which the employer was entitled in exchange for the dollars he paid as salary, and by so much as the cocktail reduced that fund of energy by exactly that much was the cocktail infringing upon his proprietorial rights and therefore an enemy to be vanquished. The campaign of "business" against alcohol was thus about on a par with the solicitude with which the Southern planter before the Civil War ministered to the health of the human chattel he had purchased at the Louisiana slave auction. It had no moral side at all, but it was allied with many exalted moral forces, and together they wrought disaster upon the brewers, distillers and saloon-keepers of the United States."

We must not delude ourselves that anything is done on exclusively moral grounds under capitalism, but on "coldly-balanced considerations of financial profit and loss." Unless morals and parity pays, our respectable masters are immoveable. Even the concessions gained by English Liberalism in the past were not won by moral suasion alone. The bourgeois never grows righteously indignant unless his interests are in jeopardy. Then he will take up the cudgels—or give them to others—in defence of honor, liberty, freedom, virtue, and so on. Thus economic criticism of capitalism quite unconsciously finds supporters amongst the bourgeoisie whenever the facts are stated and the actual tendencies of the system noted.

There is an opportunity for you to render valuable help to the revolutionary movement, by seeing that the "I.S." finds new readers in new places, and that old readers renew their subscriptions. If you wish to see the good work continue, convince us and get subscribers.

The Royal Masque.

(From "Charles the First.")

P. B. SHELLEY.

Ay, there they are—
Nobles, and sons of nobles, patentees,
Monopolists, and stewards of this poor farm,
On whose lean sheep sit the prophetic crows
Here is the pomp that strips the houseless orphan,
Here is the pride that breaks the desolate heart.
These are the lillies glorious as Solomon,
Who toil not, neither do they spin,—unless
It be the webs they catch poor rogues withal.
Here is the surfeit which to them who earn
The niggard wages of the earth, scarce leaves
The tithe that will support them till they crawl
Back to its cold hard bosom. Here is health
Followed by grim disease, glory by shame,
Waste by lank famine, wealth by squalid want,
And England's sin by England's punishment.
And, as the effect pursues the cause forgone,
Lo, giving substance to my words, behold
At once the sign and the thing signified—
A troop of cripples, beggars, and lean outcasts,
Horsed upon stumbling shapes, carted with dung,
Dragged forth to day from cellars and low cabins
And rotten living holes, to point the moral
Of this presentiment, and bring up the rear
Of painted pomp with misery!

National Library of Australia http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-page12247701

The International Socialist

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE AUSTRALIAN SOCIALIST PARTY.

RAY EVERITT ..... Managing Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Australia, 4/- per year; 1/- per quarter.
Postage added to other countries.

ORDERS FOR PAPERS.

Send to the Manager, 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney.

MATTER FOR PUBLICATION.

All articles and matter for publication must be addressed to the "Editor" and accompanied by the name and address of the writer (not necessarily for publication).

Write on one side of the paper only, and be sure to write in black ink.

A RED WRAPPER

Did you paper come in a red wrapper? **If so, your** subscription is due, and you should **renew at once** if you desire us to continue sending the paper to you.

Make Postal Notes and Money Orders payable at Haymarket Post Office, Sydney, and address them to the Manager, "I.S.", 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney, New South Wales.

The "Proletarian Review"

The working-class movement in Australia seems only to make progress by the slow and painful method of trying, experiment, and by a process of elimination, to arrive at the ultimate solution of the social problem. The past thirty odd years has seen the varous phenomena of nature classified, and understood in the light of the various natural laws governing their existence. The most complex mass of facts to be thus understood is that dealing with human society, and with the production of the necessities of life. It was not until the amount of knowledge had reached a comparatively high level that it was possible to understand the natural laws working in society, and that Marx and Engels could definitely formulate them in such a manner as to make it possible to anticipate, in at least general terms, the future relations of things and people. Sociology, once raised to this position, makes it possible for the world to progress consciously towards its goal, and, in particular, for the slave class of the day to work with an understanding of its "historic mission" in freeing itself by overthrowing the master-class.

The spreading of this understanding as far and wide as possible is an important duty of those who possess it, and is beyond question that is the point of view of those who have published a new monthly journal, "The Proletarian Review," devoted to Marxian Socialism. Under the editorship of Guido Baracchi, known to us as a close student of Marxism in the broadest sense, the columns of the "Review" should contain nothing that does not state the working class position in an uncompromising way, and always strictly in conformity with the facts and movements of history. We certainly welcome this additional factor in the clear cut revolutionary movement, and we would like to see it in the hands of as many workers as possible, and we would urge them to read it, as indeed all reading should be done, critically.

The failure of the working class to think critically is the immediate reason for their being deluded into chasing so many will o' the wisps, but the fundamental reason is the lack of knowledge, and so far as it is possible to remedy this while the working class is a slave class, it is the task of the hour to disseminate this concrete knowledge amongst the workers, but it must always be presented, not to be accepted as the last word on the question, but as the knowledge and experience of others to be received critically by the reader.

It is centreing round this word critical that fault must be found with certain matter in the economic definitions on page eleven, taken from the S.L.P. edition of Value, Price and Profit.

With reference to these it need only be said that they cannot be placed alongside Marx's own statements on the particular points, and that were they critically examined it would be seen that they are far from satisfactory.

Yet in its first number the "Proletarian Review" is decidedly valuable, and Baracchi and P. Laidler, as Editor and Publisher, are to be congratulated on the issue to hand.—A.T.B.

NOTICE.

Owing to the two holidays last week, and the consequent inability to obtain linotype sufficiently early to publish in time to catch trains and posts, there was no issue of the "I.S." last week.

THE Revolutionary Outlook

By MARCIA.

FAMINE FOR WHOM?

We are having gloomy predictions lately per medium of the Capitalist press concerning the future food supply of Europe, and incidentally Australia. Of course, serious trouble in this respect is quite likely to happen; famine and misery are attendants on all wars; and if there is a world-wide shortage of food, it will of course be the working class that will, as always, be the chief sufferers. However, there is one point that we can take comfort from, that terrible as the suffering will be in case of a famine, it will serve to bring about the world's revolution all the quicker. The proletariat class of all countries have reached the limit of their endurance; they have suffered misery, hunger, disease at the dictates of the master class until they have come to that stage where they will endure no more. We can safely say as we read reports of expected famine, deplorable as it is, it is the final stroke that the workers will have to bear; they will rise in no uncertain manner; and then it will be our turn.

* * * *

"DOLL-MAKING INDUSTRY.

Melbourne, Thursday.—In a desire to encourage the doll-making industry in the Commonwealth, the Federal Government proclaims that heads, limbs, eyes, and wigs, for use in the manufacture of dolls will be admitted into Australia free of duty." "Telegraph," Sydney, June 11th.

Here we have a good sample of the fine enterprising genius of OUR Federal Government; in these times of famine, poverty, and terrible conditions, it will certainly be of great benefit to the MASTER CLASS to have a new industry, whereby they can derive more profits; it will also very likely provide more work.

We have to remember that so far as dolls and toys are concerned they are only for the children of the rich: the poor have all their work cut out to buy bread out of their miserable pittance. However, let us leave "fools to their foolishness" while the puppets of the master class go on encouraging the making of more puppets; let us of the working class keep on with our educating and organising towards the coming Revolution.

* * * *

PRESERVING THE RED COATS.

In reply to a question re supplying the army with uniforms, etc., Mr. Churchill stated that full dress would be immediately issued to certain regiments.

"He contended that the historic uniforms of the British Army carried with them a sense of continuity and regimental tradition which were good for recruiting discipline. Re-clothing was well worth while if it was done thriftily." "Herald," June 11th.

So we see that the army is still to be kept with all its traditions, expense, and show; also we notice the significant fact that the British Master Class are considering what is best for "RECRUITING AND DISCIPLINE."

If the last War was to crush German militarism for ever, and make the world safe for Democracy; why the need for such elaborate preparations towards building up the army? The last war was to be the final one we were told, why do they want to recruit and discipline the armed force?

Is it to fight against the German WORKING class or the Russian Working Class or the English Working Class in case of upheavals against their masters? The British rulers realise the necessity of keeping up their armed force to safeguard their position; they want an army, not to keep the world safe for democracy, but to keep it safe for a system of exploitation and robbery, wherein the few tyrannise over and make profit out of the many.

They want an army and they will organise one for their own purposes, but whether it will finally be used for the purpose for which it was formed, time alone will tell.

* * * *

THE MELBOURNE STRIKE.

In the news from Melbourne in "The Sun" of June 13, the Government were applying for volunteers, in the emergency, of course, they always do; and usually obtain them; however, in this case we were pleased to learn from the same columns that the assistance received was chiefly from University students and such like individuals. If this is a fact it is encouraging to learn that the workers of Melbourne cannot be induced to scab upon each other, as has been the case in so many previous strikes; but are at last realising that they are all members of one class.

We have got to remember that scabs are just as much products of economic conditions as many other unpleasant things; and cold, hunger and want will make men do what they otherwise would never think of; the master class have this in mind when they admit that an unemployed army is a necessity for the upkeep of the system; but, however, in this particular case, it looks as if class solidarity is being shown, and it is a good sign, not only for the success of this particular fight, but for that of the final struggle, which will be, not for higher wages or shorter hours, but for the final emancipation of the workers as a class.

* * * *

HOUSELESS WORKERS.

Nearly all of us have seen photographs of the Prince's quarters on board the Renown, all of us know the extent of his various Royal residences in England, and his luxurious housing arrangements out here. At the same time that such luxury is being prepared for one man, numbers of members of our class are wandering about the cold, dreary streets, vainly endeavouring to find a shelter.

The housing proposition has become serious; hundreds of people are being turned from their homes, without the slightest chance of obtaining others. The columns of the Press contain references to the woes of the women, who either have too many children, or are not able to give the agent bonus he asks for.

The result of this state of affairs is, that two, three, or even more families are crowding into one house; perhaps inhabiting one room each; and it has the effect of completely undermining the home life as it should exist.

Enemies of Socialism urge that it will break up family life, but we boldly assert that Capitalism itself with its bad conditions, unemployment, wars and poverty, is fast shattering every semblance of it. The working class have never enjoyed home life in its fullest sense; their economic insecurity forbids it; but matters are now growing intolerable. The overcrowding now existing is corrupting the morals, undermining the health, and destroying the family life of the people; and not until the workers rise and accomplish the revolution and inaugurate the Socialist Republic, will they know and understand home life in its true sense.

* * * *

STARVING (?) RUSSIA.

The Press lately has been enlightening us a little further re conditions in Russia; emphasising the fact of its state of famine and disease. While we do not admit the truth of the evidently exaggerated report, we have got to remember two or three items in connection with it which are certainly worth bringing before the notice of those who are more credulous than we are.

First no one has attempted to make out that Russia at the present time is an earthly Paradise. Bad conditions forced the Russian Revolution, and it will take some time before the workers there reorganise industry, and as it were, put their house in order; but conditions in Russia according to authentic authorities are better than they have ever been and are improving, while those depreciators of Bolshevism forget to tell you that misery, hunger, and disease in rampant here in Australia; that conditions have never been so bad as now, and are steadily growing worse.

When the Revolution comes, we do not expect to step straight into Elysium, although thanks to industrial development, our position will be probably an improvement on that of our Russian comrades, but we shall know that though the struggle will be strenuous for a time, conditions must grow better, because the interest of the community will be studied in all cases, and not those of a few individuals.

JUDD-REARDON DEBATE.

ANOTHER LIE NAILED.

—:o:—

(Editor "I.S.")

Sir,—Upon my return from abroad to-day I was shown a letter written by E. E. Judd, and published in the "R.S." (March 11, 1920), concerning the Judd-Reardon debate. In the epistle appears a mis-statement which I desire to correct. Judd says: that I (the reporter) informed him on Sunday afternoon, Feb. 29, that I had supplied the editor of "I.S." with THREE copies of the transcript. What I told Comrade Judd prior to Feb. 29, was that three typewritten copies of the transcript of the JUDD-BARITZ debate had been supplied. On Feb. 29 I told him that only ONE of the Judd-Reardon debate and that that copy had been left with Comrade Everitt at the "I.S." office, adding that he would be notified in ample time for his perusal before its publication, as agreed upon prior to the debate. In point of fact it was not until the night of Feb. 29 that I signed the proofs of Judd-Reardon debate as correct.—Fraternally yours,

C. J. JOYCE.

(We received the above from C. J. Joyce, who reported the Judd-Reardon debate. When the statements were made in the "R.S." those in charge of that journal were aware of the fact that Joyce had sailed for the U.S.A., but as to whether they knew that he was coming back so soon we cannot say. However, we did, and therefore realised that it only meant waiting a little while and the lie would be convincingly nailed.

"SOVIET RUSSIA."

The third issue of "Soviet Russia," published by the Bureau of the Soviet Government in Australia, is now on sale, and contains much that is informative and worthy of the attention of all workers. Claiming to be a monthly "devoted to the spread of truth about Russia," the June issue does this in a comprehensive way with articles dealing with the internal conditions of Soviet Russia, and with the circumstances of the military operations of the Allies against the workers' State. In addition to a selection of the latest wireless messages from Moscow, there are two maps which should prove valuable in understanding the extent and sphere of the military operations.

Subscriptions (six shillings a year, three shillings per half year) should be sent direct to P. SIMONOFF, 28 Station House, Rawson Place, Sydney.

National Library of Australia http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-page12247702

The Collapse of the Second International.

By Nicolai Lenin.

Translated by A. SIRNIS,

for the Socialist Labour Press, Glasgow, from whose publication we print.

CHAPTER IV.

SOCIALIST JINGOISM: CAN THE WAR BE JUSTIFIED FROM A WORKING-CLASS POINT OF VIEW

What is the explanation of the betrayal of Socialism by the "leaders" of the Second International. The two chief apologists for Socialist jingoism are Plekhanov and Kautsky. Plekhanov repeats the bourgeois arguments of Hyndman, etc., but Kautsky is more sophistic. Theoretically, Kautsky's arguments appear better founded. The most hackneyed apology for the betrayal of Socialism in the crude excuse of defence against "oppression." "We were attacked and are defending ourselves," therefore, it is argued, that "the interests of the proletariat demand that we oppose those who violate the peace of Europe." This is but a re-hash of the declarations of every government and of the vapourings of the yellow press. "We must find the aggressor and make short shrift of him, postponing all other questions until a further occasion," says Plekhanov in his pamphlet "On War," Paris 1914, and Axelrod echoes this in the "Golos," No's 86 and 87. Plekhanov substitutes sophistry for dialectics. One can find "arguments" to prove anything under the sun, Hegel has rightly said. Sophistry picks out one plausible argument and parades it, but dialectics demand a many-sided investigation of any given object. To get at the truth we must investigate social phenomena in the course of its development: seek beneath the external surface manifestations of the driving forces, and examine their relations to the productive forces and the class struggle.

Plekhanov picks out a quotation from the German Socialist press and draws attention to the fact that the Germans themselves, before the war, regarded Austria and Germany as the aggressors—this, in his eyes, caps the argument. He passes over in silence the fact that Russian Socialists have repeatedly exposed the plans of conquest of Tsarism in regard to Galicia, Armenia, and so forth. He makes no attempt to touch upon the economic and diplomatic history of the last three decades. The history of this period proves irrefutably that it was the seizure of colonies, the plunder of foreign lands, and the struggle between competitors for markets that formed the main pivot upon which turned the policy of the two groups at present at war.*

As applied to wars, the fundamental proposition of dialectics, so shamelessly distorted by Plekhanov to please the bourgeoisie, consists in that "war is merely a continuation of politics by other (namely by violent) means." Thus it is formulated by Clausewitz,† one of the great writers on questions of military history, whose ideas have been fructified by Hegel. Such was always the point of view of Marx and Engels, who regarded every war as a continuation of the policy of vested interested powers—and of divers classes within it—at a given time.

Plekhanov's coarse jingoism occupies the same position as the more refined conciliatory jingoism of Kautsky, when the latter blesses, by the following argument, the passage of the Socialists of all countries over to the side of "their" capitalists.

Everyone has the right, and is bound, to defend his country; true internationalism consists in recognising that the Socialists of all nations, including the nations at war with mine, have this right (see "Neue Zeit," October 2nd, 1914, and other writings of the same author.)

This argument, of which there is no like, is such a vulgar mockery of Socialism that the best answer to it would be to strike a medal with the heads of William II. and Nicholas II. on the one side, and of Plekhanov and Kautsky on the other. True internationalism, then, lies in justifying French workmen when they fire at German workmen, and the German workmen when they fire at the French—in the name of "national defence"!

Yet, if we take a closer look at the theoretical premises of Kautsky's arguments we arrive at the view which was laughed out of court by Clausewitz 80 years ago. Kautsky's arguments amounts to this: "When a war begins the political relations between nations and classes, evolved historically, cease to exist, and quite a different situation arises! There are simply those who attack and those who defend themselves." The oppression of a whole series of nations, which form more than half the population of the world, by the great Imperialist Powers, competition between the bourgeoisie of these countries arising out of a division of the booty, the attempt of capital to split and crush the labor movement—all these facts have suddenly vanished from Plekhanov and Kautsky's field of vision, though they themselves, in the course of decades before the war, outlined a policy based upon these facts.

Slanderous references to Marx and Engels constitute the "chief" arguments of these two leaders of Socialist jingoism. Plekhanov recalls the national war of Prussia in 1813, and of Germany in 1870; Kautsky proves, with a learned mien, that Marx weighed the question as to which bourgeoise side was more desirable in the wars of 1845-1855, 1859, and 1870-1871. Kautsky also proves that the Marxist reflected likewise regarding the wars of 1876-1877 and 1897. The method of all sophists, at all times, has been to quote examples which unmistakably refer to cases different in principle. The former wars pointed out to us were a "continuation of the policy" pursued during many years by the nationalist movement of the bourgeoisie against foreign oppression by some other nationality and against absolutism (Turkish and Russian). Apart from the question as to whether the success of one or the other bourgeoisie was preferable there could have been no other. There was no reason why Marxists should not have appealed to nations beforehand to take part in wars of a similar type by inflaming national hatred, as did Marx in 1848 and, later, in the war against Russia; and as Engels incited the national hatred of the Germans in 1859 against oppressors Napoleon III. and Russian Tsarism.*

To compare a "continuation of the policy" of the bourgeois struggle against feudalism and absolutism—the policy of the bourgeoisie which is liberating itself—with the "continuation of the policy," of a decrepit reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie which has plundered the whole world, and which in close alliance with the feudal elements crushes the proletariat, is like comparing yards with hundredweights. It is like comparing Robespierre, Garibaldi, and Zhelabov, who were representatives of the bourgeoisie," with Millerand, Salandra, and Guchkov, who are also "representatives of the bourgeoisie." One cannot be a Marxist and fail to cherish the deepest regard for the great bourgeois revolutionaries who had a historical right to speak in the name of their bourgeois "fatherlands," which were raising new nations—comprising millions and tens of millions of men—to a civilised level of existence and sending them to battle against feudalism. And one cannot be a Marxist without feeling contempt for the sophistry of Plekhanov and Kautsky, who speak of "national defence" in connection with the throttling of Belgium by German imperialists, or in connection with the deals of the imperialists of England, France, Russia, and Italy concerning the plundering of Austria and Turkey.

Socialist jingoism has another "Marxism" theory to the effect that Socialism is based on a speedy development of capitalism, that "my country's development will accelerate the evolution which will hasten the advent of Socialism, whereas my country's defeat would retard its economic development and likewise the inauguration of Socialism." Such a theory a la Struve, is being developed amongst us Russians by Plekhanov, and among the Germans by Lensch and others. Kautsky argues against this crude theory, in opposition to Lensch, who defends it openly, and against Cunow, who supports it in a more guarded way. But Kautsky argues merely to the end that he may bring about the reconciliation of the Socialist jingoes of all countries on the basis of a more refined and a still more jesuitical jingoistic theory.

We need not tarry over the examination of this crude theory. Struve's "Critical Notes" appeared in 1894, and in the course of twenty years the Russian Socialists had ample time to acquaint themselves with this "method" whereby educated Russians of the middle class propagate their views and desires under the guise of "Marxism" purged of its revolutionary features. Struvism* is not only a Russian, but, as recent events have shown most clearly, it is an international striving of bourgeois theoreticians, to kill Marxism "by kindness"; to strangle it in an embrace and by a would-be recognition of "all the truly scientific" aspects an elements of Marxism, save its "demagogic Utopian-Blanquist propaganda" aspect. To put it in other words, from Marxism is to be taken everything that is acceptable to the Liberal bourgeoisie, including the fight for reforms and the class struggle (without the dictatorship of the proletariat), including a "general" recognition of "Socialist ideals" and the substitution of a "new system" for capitalism. This means the destruction of the living soul of Marxism, its revolutionary character.

Marxism is a theory of the proletariat's march to freedom. It is clear, therefore, that class-conscious workers must pay great attention to the process by which Struvism is being substituted for Marxism. The motive powers of this process are manifold and varied. We shall note the three principal:—

1. The development of science furnishes more and more material to prove that Marxism is right. Therefore, capitalism is obliged to fight it hypocritically, without openly opposing its basis and by pretending to recognise, by means of sophisms, its contentions. By thus castrating Marxism and transforming it into a "holy image," they hope to render it harmless to the bourgeoisie.

2. The development of opportunism amongst social democracy upholds precisely such a "modification" of Marxism and makes it serve the end of justifying all sorts of concessions to opportunism.

3. The period of imperialism means the division of the world between the "great" privileged nations which oppress all the others. Undoubtedly, certain crumbs from the plunder, arising out of these privileges and this oppression, fall to the lot of certain sections of the lower middle class, aristocracy, bureaucracy, and a privileged minority of the working class. This last section, which constitutes an infinitesimal section of the labouring class, has a leaning towards "Struvism," for it justifies their union with the national bourgeoisie as opposed to the oppressed masses of all nations. We shall have to come back to this question again when we discuss the causes of the collapse of the International.

CHAPTER V.

"ULTRA-IMPERIALISM" VERSUS REVOLUTIONARY MASS ACTION.

The Socialist jingo theory of "ultra-imperialism" put forward by Kautsky is very subtle and most skilfully arranged to bear a scientific and internationalist aspect. The author himself recently formulated the theory with great clearness, as follows:

> The weakening of the protectionist movement in England, the lowering of the duties in America, the striving after disarmament, the quick shrinkage of the capital exported from France and Germany during the years before the war, and, finally, the growing interlinking of the various international cliques representing finance-capital—all these factors induced me to weigh the possibility of the present imperialist policy being ousted by a new ultra-imperialist policy which would substitute for the mutual struggle of the various national units of finance-capital, the general exploitation of the world by a united international finance-capital. Such a new phase of capitalism is at all events thinkable. As to whether it be feasible, the premises for solving this question are not yet sound enough. ("Neue Zeit," No. 5, April 30th, 1915, p. 144.)
>
> . . . The trend and the result of the present war may prove to be the deciding factors in this regard. The war may utterly crush the feeble germs of ultra-imperialism by inflaming to the highest degree national hatred, even amongst capitalist financiers, by intensifying the growth of armaments and the desire to outbid each other in this respect, thus rendering inevitable a second world war. In that case the anticipation formulated in my pamphlet "The Path to Power," will to a terrible extent come true. Class antagonisms will become more acute and will at the same time hasten the moral Abwirtschaftung* (downfall) of capitalism.
>
> . . . But the war may end differently. It may bring about a strengthening of the weak germs of ultra-imperialism. Its lessons (note this!) may accelerate a development which might have been slower in times of peace. If things come to such a pitch, if agreement between nations and disarmament becomes a fact, together with a lasting peace, then the worst of the causes which before the war were tending more and more to bring about the moral downfall of capitalism may disappear. The new phase, of course, will bring with it "fresh calamities for the proletariat," which may be even worse than the present one, yet for

---

*"The War of Steel and Gold," by Brailsford (London, 1914. The book bears the date March, 1914), the English pacifist who is given prone to masquerade as a Socialist, is very instructive. The author recognises clearly that in a general way nationalist questions occupy a secondary place, and that they have already been solved (p. 35); that they do not constitute the main point, and that "the typical question for contemporary diplomacy" (p. 36) is the Bagdad railway, furnishing it with rails, mines in Morocco, and so forth. The author rightly regards as one of the "most instructive" incidents in the latest history of European diplomacy the struggle of the French patriots and English imperialists against the attempts of Caillaux (in 1911 and 1913) to become reconciled to Germany on the basis of an agreement concerning the demarkation of colonial spheres of interest and concerning the admission of German securities to the Paris Stock Exchange. The English and French bourgeoisie rendered this attempt abortive (pp. 38-40). The object of imperialism is to export capital to the weaker countries (p. 74). In 1899 the profits on this capital in England amounted to £90,000,000-£100,000,000 (Giffen), and to £1[illegible],000,000 in 1909 (Paish). Lloyd George, in a recent speech, reckoned these profits, let us add, at £200,000,000. Shady dealings with, and bribery of Turkish nobility, soft jobs for sons in India and Egypt—these are things that matter (pp. 85-87). An insignificant majority derives gain from armaments and wars, but it is supported by society and financiers, whereas the adherents of peace are supported by a divided population (p. 93). A pacifist who, to-day, talks of peace and disarmament, to-morrow turns out to be a member of a party which is completely dependent upon war contractors (p. 161). If the Triple Entente turns out to be more powerful it will capture Morocco and divide Persia; if the Triple Alliance turns out to be the more powerful it will take Tripoli, consolidate its position in Bosnia, and subdue Turkey (p. 167). London and Paris advanced millions to Russia in 1906, and thus assisted Tsarism to crush the liberation movement (pp. 225-8); at the present time England helps Russia to throttle Persia (p. 229). Russia instigated the Balkan war (p. 230). Of course, there is nothing fresh in all this. These facts are known to all and have been repeated a thousand times in the Socialist Press of the whole world. On the eve of the war an English bourgeois sees all these things with surprising clearness. In the face of these simple and commonly known facts, what indecent nonsense, what unbearable hypocrisy, what sickening falsehood are Plekhanov and Petrosov's theories concerning the culpability of Germany, or the theories of Kautsky concerning "possibilities" of disarmament and a lasting peace under capitalism.

†Carl von Clausewitz, "Vom Kriege," works, vol. i., p. 28. See vol. iii., pp. 138-140: "Everyone knows that wars are provoked only by the political relations which exist between governments and nations; generally people imagine that when wars begins these relations cease, and that quite a different situation arises, subject to its own special laws. We assert the reverse: war is but a continuation of the political relations; through the employment of other means."

*By the way, Mr. Gardenin, in the "Zhizn," calls it "revolutionary Chauvinism" on the part of Marx who, in 1848, was in favor of a revolutionary war against the European nations, which by their action had proved themselves reactionary—namely, the Slavs and the Russians in particular. The fact that Marx is thus reproached merely proves the opportunism (or perhaps, more correctly, complete want of seriousness) of this Socialist Revolutionary of the "Left Wing." We Marxists have always been, and still are, in favor of a revolutionary war against counter-revolutionary nations. For instance, if Socialism became victorious in Europe or America, and Japan and China made a move against us we should be in favor of waging an offensive revolutionary war upon these countries. Does this strike you as strange, Mr. Gardenin? You are a revolutionary of the type of Ropshin!

*The teaching of Professor Struve, a well-known Russian Liberal.—"Trans."

*We must here note that by this pretentious word Kautsky understands simply "enmity" towards capitalism on the part of "the sections which are placed between the proletariat and finance capital, that is to say, the intellectuals, members of the lower middle class, and even petty capitalists."

National Library of Australia http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-page12247703

The State and Revolution

By V. I. ULIANOV (N. LENIN)

A Brilliant Statement of the Marxian attitude on "Democracy," "Freedom" and "Opportunism" in relation to the Master Class Dictatorship---The State, and

The Task of the Proletariat in the Revolution

PRICE 2/6 MAKE SURE OF SECURING A COPY. ORDER NOW **Posted 2/7**

Cash Must Accompany all Orders

A.S.P. Literature Dept., 115 Goulburn St., Sydney

a time ultra-imperialism could create an era of fresh hopes and expectations within the confines of capitalism." (p. 145).

How does he deduce a justification of Socialist jingoism from this "theory"?

It is done in the following manner: a strange one for a "theoretician": Social-Democrats of the Left wing in Germany say that imperialism and the wars produced by it are not an accident but a necessary product of capitalism which has led to the domination of finance capital. Therefore, transition to a revolutionary struggle on the part of the masses is needed, for we have come to the end of the comparatively peaceful period. Social-Democrats of the "Right Wing" decl[illegible] crudely, that since imperialism is necessary we must be imperialists, too. Kautsky, who sides with the "Centre," tries to act as conciliator.

"The extreme Left," Kautsky says in his pamphlet, "The National State, the Imperialist State, and a Union of States" (Nuremberg, 1915), "wants to oppose Socialism to inevitable imperialism—that is to say, not merely the propaganda of Socialism which we have opposed to capitalist domination in every form in the course of half a century, but an immediate realisation of Socialism. This appears to be a radical step, but capable of driving into the camp of imperialism all who do not believe in an immediate practical realisation of Socialism" (p. 17. The black is ours.)

When speaking of the immediate realisation of Socialism, Kautsky resorts to exaggeration, for he knows that in Germany, especially under military censorship, one cannot speak of revolutionary action. He knows well that those of the Left wing desire the party to do propaganda work forthwith and to prepare for revolutionary action, and not for "the immediate practical realisation of Socialism."

Those of the Left wing deduce the necessity of revolutionary action from the inevitableness of imperialism. "The theory of ultra-imperialism serves Kautsky to whitewash the opportunists, to put the whole thing in such a light as if the latter had not gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie, but had merely "no faith" in the immediate realisation of Socialism, or in the expectation that "there may ensue" a new era of disarmament and of a lasting peace. The "theory" merely amounts to this, that by the expectation of a new peaceful era of capitalism Kautsky justifies the opportunists, and the official S.D. parties which have joined the bourgeoisie and have repudiated revolutionary, i.e., proletarian tactics during the present stormy period, in spite of the solemn declarations contained in the Basle resolution! It should be noted that Kautsky does not declare that a new phase is resulting, and must result, from such and such circumstances and conditions. He declares plainly that he cannot even decide the question as to whether such a new phase is "feasible." And, indeed, let us glance at the "tendencies" which portend the new era pointed out by Kautsky. It is surprising that the author enumerates the "striving for disarmament" as an economic fact! This means to forsake undoubted facts which are compatible with the theory of the weakening of antagonisms, and to take cover under innocent bourgeois chatter and fantasies. Kautsky's "ultra-imperialism" though, by the way, this term does not at all express what the author wishes it to convey—means that under capitalism (class) antagonisms have been greatly weakened. Though they tell us of the weakening of the protectionist movement both in England and America, where do we espy therein the slightest tendency towards a new era? Though protectionism—which in America has reached its highest pitch—has been weakened, it still remains protectionism, as also remain the privileges and preferential tariffs in those of the English colonies which favor England. Let us recall what induced a substitution of the present-day imperialist era for the former "peaceful" era of capitalism. The facts are that free competition has given way to capitalist monopolies, and that the whole globe has been divided up. It is clear that both these facts and factors have a real world significance. Free Trade and peaceful competition were possible and necessary as long as there was nothing to hinder capital from increasing the number of its colonies and from seizing unoccupied lands in Africa and elsewhere; furthermore, the concentration of capital was then weak, and there did not exist monopolies gigantic enough to dominate the whole of a certain branch of industry. The inception and growth of such monopolies (this process has probably not yet been arrested either in England or America, and possibly not even Kautsky will dare to deny that the war has accelerated and intensified it) renders the former free competition impossible, cuts the ground from under its feet, whereas the division of the globe compels the rivals to pass from peaceful expansion to an armed struggle for a re-division of colonies and of spheres of influence. It is ridiculous to imagine that the weakening of protectionism in two countries can change the essence of the question.

Then there is the export of capital from two countries for a number of years. These two countries, France and Germany, according to Harms's statistics of 1912, had capital invested abroad to the amount of about 35 milliard marks (about £1,700,000,000) each. England has double that amount invested.*

The growth of the capital exported never was, and never could be, uniform under capitalism. Kautsky cannot possibly imply that the growth of capital has been checked or that, for instance, the home market has absorbed more capital because a considerable improvement in the condition of the masses has been effected. It is impossible under such circumstances to deduce the advent of a new era from a decrease in the capital exported in a given number of years from two countries.

"The growing interlinking of the international cliques representing finance-capital"—this is indeed the only universal and undoubted tendency which manifests itself, not in the course of a few years, nor in two countries alone, but under capitalism throughout the whole world. But why should there arise from it a striving for disarmament and not for armaments, as heretofore? Let us take a gun-manufacturing firm (or any firm manufacturing military supplies), such as that of Armstrong, for instance. The English "Economist," May, 1915, recently stated that the firm's profits amounted to £606,000 for 1905-6, and rose to £856,000 in 1913, and to £940,000 in 1914. The interlinking of finance capital in this industry is very great, and continues to grow; German capitalists "take part" in the business of the English firm; the English firm's build submarines for Austria, and so forth. Capital interlinked internationally does splendid business in armaments and wars. To induce an economic tendency towards disarmament from the amalgamation and interlinking of various units of capital into a single international whole means the substitution of goody-goody lower middle-class desires for a weakening of class antagonisms, for the real fact that such antagonisms are actually becoming more acute.

*See Bernhard Harms: "Probleme der Weltwirtschaft," Jena, 1912.—George Paish: "Great Britain's Capital Investments in Colonies, etc.," in the "Journal of the Royal Statistical Society," vol. lxxv., 1910-11, p. 167. Lloyd George, in his speech at the beginning of 1915, considered that British capital invested abroad amounted to about £4,000,000,000.

(Continued next week.)

HOLLAND AND BARITZ.

We received from J. Kirk, secretary of the Marxian Association, N. Zealand, a lengthy reply to the statements of H. E. Holland concerning Moses Baritz, which were published in the "Socialist" of Melbourne. As the "Socialist" has published this reply, there is no need for us to take up space with it, but we wish to state that the Marxian Association stood solidly behind the attitude adopted by Baritz in N. Zealand. We also wish it to be clearly understood that it is not out of sympathy for Holland that we do not publish the reply, for whatever he has been in the past, to-day he is the leader of those whom in the past he criticised as being Labor's most dangerous enemies—those who prostitute the working class movement under the name of "Labor."

Australian Socialist Party

NEWS AND NOTES

CENTRAL EXECUTIVE.

C. E. delegates are reminded that the next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 1st. All delegates are requested to attend.

SYDNEY BRANCH.

On Sunday, June 13th, Com. A. S. Reardon lectured to a large audience on "Germany and the World's Revolution." Recent events in Germany made this lecture very timely and opportune and the speaker's remarks which set out in sequence the happenings in that country from the revolt in 1918 were extremely interesting.

They showed beyond doubt that the German situation was good and we could hope for great advances at any time.

Com. Baracchi arrived in Sydney on Saturday, June 19th, and gave his first lecture on Sunday night, which according to promise, was entitled "Marxian Fundamentals." We intend reporting Com. Baracchi's lectures in full, so all it is necessary to say at this stage is that the speaker was accorded a warm reception by the large audience present, and kept his hearers interested for about one and a half hours. The lecture itself left no doubt as to the speaker's capabilities as a Marxian student, and we anticipate even larger crowds at his forthcoming lectures.

The Sunday School was inaugurated on Sunday, June 20th, with Comrades Morris and White in charge, and we hope shortly to have a large and interested attendance of pupils.

Domain meetings have been specially large and successful of late, and literature and paper sales good.

MARICA REARDON, Asst. Sec.

PRESS FUND.

We would urge all members and supporters to make an effort and secure subscribers, and also donations to the press fund, in order that we will be able to meet the great increase in materials and continue to publish at 1d. We do not desire to raise the price, despite the fact that we would be quite in the fashion if we did so, but unless comrades give plenty of consistent financial support we will be forced to do so.

The columns of the "I.S.," unlike the numerous other working class papers, have been free from the continuous wail for donations, and we make this appeal very reluctantly.

The increases in our outlay on the past have been met by still greater efforts on the part of our supporters in increasing the circulation, and we are confident that our present difficulties will be overcome in a like manner. Let those who can, send along donations to meet the immediate needs, and let all our readers secure at least one new subscriber, and there will be no necessity for any further appeals.

We acknowledge, with thanks, the following donations: H. Quaife, 2/; R. Blair, 5/; Kurri Kurri A.S.P., £4; B. McNamara, 2/6; C. Hughes, 12/.

Printed and published by Raymond Everitt at the Marxian Printing Works, 115 Goulburn Street, Sydney, for the Australian Socialist Party.

National Library of Australia http://nla.gov.au/nla.news-page12247704